UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,612	06/19/2006	Bartlomiej Jan Pawlak	NL031498	8409
65913 NXP, B.V.	7590 08/29/201	1	EXAMINER	
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & LICENSING			SENE, PAPE A	
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY	DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA	95131		2812	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/29/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/596,612	PAWLAK ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
PAPE SENE	2812

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) solution will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)13. ☑ Other: Please see NOTE below.
/ANGEL ROMAN Jr./ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2812

## Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

NOTE: With respect to claim 1: With respect to the arguments that the second amorphous layer is on the top surface of the second amorphous layer, examiner points out that applicants did not claim that the second amorphous layer is on the top surface of the substrate. Combining Wang and Keys do not result of 218 being on the top surface of the substrate, and does not either result in 212 being outside of the substrate. Keys is only used to disclose a partial crystallization of the first amorphous layer. In Keys, what is partially regrown is 202, the first amorphous layer that comprises the implanted first dopant region having a first doping profile. Applicants did not claim recrystallizing the implanted first dopant region having a first doping profile. Applicants did not claim nor disclose that the entire first amorphous layer is doped, which would result to a depth same as the first depth (depth of the first amorphous layer). For the purpose of compact prosecution and overcoming the prior art of record used to reject claim 1, examiner suggests that applicants become more specific in their claims with respect to the implanting of the first amorphous layer, pointing out that the depth of the implanted first dopant region having a first doping profile with respect to the first depth and second depth or that as shown if fig. 1c of application, the entire amorphous layer is doped such that the implanted first dopant region has a depth greater than the depth of the first amorphous layer. With respect to claim 8, the term "top surface" depends on how the device is postioned, and applicants did not claim the top surface as being in contact with either the first area or the second are, but only as being adjacent to both the first area and the second area. For the purpose of compact prosecution and overcoming the prior art of record used to reject claim 8, examiner suggests applicants to define the top surface contacting the first area".